



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,748	12/19/2003	Tin Qian	MI1103.70168US00	4932
45840 7590 12/23/2009 WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation) C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206				
EXAMINER WANG, HARRIS C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2439				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/23/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Application No. 10/740,748</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Applicant(s) QIAN ET AL.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Examiner HARRIS C. WANG</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Art Unit 2439</td> </tr> </table>	Application No. 10/740,748	Applicant(s) QIAN ET AL.	Examiner HARRIS C. WANG	Art Unit 2439
Application No. 10/740,748	Applicant(s) QIAN ET AL.				
Examiner HARRIS C. WANG	Art Unit 2439				

All Participants:
 (1) HARRIS C. WANG.
 (2) James Morris.

Status of Application: _____
 (3) Inna Vitol.
 (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 December 2009 **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
New Matter rejection regarding the limitation "when an application is initiated...to create at least one policy for the application"

Claims discussed:
1

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Edan Orgad/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner made a new matter rejection regarding the limitation "when an application is initiated..." Applicant's explanation in the response still did not clarify the limitation for the Examiner. In lieu of making a second new matter rejection, the Examiner called the Applicant for clarification on how the pseudo-code in Exhibit C supported the claim limitations.

The Applicant explained that the "application rule" that is matched is simply an "if condition" to determine what type of application is initiated and not the policy itself. After determining which application is initiated, then a policy is created. Applicant also clarified that the "when an application is initiated..." is directed for both the "first user" and the "second user."

.